

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application after this Amendment. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. In light of the remarks contained herein, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Wright et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,721,802) in view of *Ward* (U.S. Patent No. 6,784,924). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Prior Art Rejections

In support of the Examiner's rejection of claim 1, the Examiner admits that *Wright et al.* fails to teach or suggest the newly added claim elements. The Examiner relies on the teachings of *Ward* to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Wright et al.* asserting *Ward* discloses enabling selection of one of the plurality of menu buttons, wherein each of the plurality of menu buttons corresponds to one of a plurality of services (col. 3, lines 10-14), including an image storage service, an image print service (col. 3, lines 28-29), and a mobile phone service (col. 2, lines 5-11). The Examiner further asserts that *Ward* discloses enabling selection of a menu update button, which updates information associated with the plurality of menu buttons (col. 2, lines 62-67). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the teachings of *Ward*.

The disclosure of *Ward* is directed to a camera receiving a network configuration file enabling the camera to transmit images from an electronic still camera over a network without connecting to a personal computer. At col. 3, lines 26-28, *Ward* merely discloses that the selected image files may be tagged with a code indicating which service is requested.

In contrast, the present invention of claim 1 recites "...enabling selection of one of a plurality of menu buttons, wherein each of the plurality of menu buttons corresponds to one of a plurality of services including an image storage service, an image print service, and a mobile

phone screen service.” There is no discussion in *Ward* that is directed to any menu buttons. *Ward* simply discloses tagging an image file with a code that indicates which service is requested. There is no disclosure in *Ward* that is directed to how the services are requested.

Further, the Examiner relies on col. 2, lines 5-11 to disclose a menu button corresponding to mobile telephone screen service. However, at this citation, *Ward* merely discloses that the transmission of images may occur immediately after the pictures are taken if the camera has a built-in cellular phone modem. These teachings are insufficient to teach or suggest the claim element of a menu button corresponding to a mobile telephone screen service.

Finally, the Examiner relies on col. 2, lines 62-67 to teach enabling selection of a menu update button, which updates information associated with the plurality of menu buttons. However, at this citation, *Ward* discloses the initial download of the configuration file in the camera. There is no disclosure in *Ward* regarding updating any menu button information. Further, there is no disclosure in *Ward* regarding enabling selection of a menu update button, which updates information associated with the plurality of menu buttons.

As such, Applicant maintains that *Ward* fails to cure the deficiencies of the teachings of *Wright et al.* As neither of the references, either alone or in combination, assuming these references are properly combinable which Applicant does not admit, teach or suggest all of the claim elements, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is not obvious over the references as cited by the Examiner. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that claims 2-12 are allowable for the reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1 at least based on their dependency on claim 1. It is further respectfully submitted that claim 13 includes elements similar to those discussed above with regard to claim 1 and thus claim 13, together with claims dependent thereon, are not obvious over the references as cited. It is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejection be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Catherine M. Voisinet (Reg. No. 52,327) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: April 26, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael K. Mutter

Registration No.: 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant